# BURUNDI - COVID-19 AF: Approval Memo to CEO

**The application was virtually reviewed (no meeting) by:** Margarita Focas Licht, Matthew Smith, David Balwanz, Adrien Boucher, Simon Hall, Sissy Helguero and Ines Gabrielle Boumaiza.

1. **Grant Summary:** Burundi is applying for a US$10 million grant, revised to US$7 million, with UNICEF as grant agent, to implement part of the education sector plan designed to respond to the impact of Covid-19. The project will aim to ensure learning continuity during school closure (through distance learning based on print, radio, TV, online materials) and support school reopening while ensuring the safety and wellbeing of students and teachers as well as optimum operation of schools (notably through a WASH program, psychosocial support, awareness campaigns on COVID prevention, provision of hygiene and dignity kits, school canteens, students catchup measures). In addition to national, system-level activities, several activities will be specifically targeted to benefit the most vulnerable children, including girls, children in rural and suburban areas and children living with disabilities.

2. **Key information:**

| **Country: Burundi** | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. | Accelerated Funding Covid-19 Allocation | US$ 10M revised to US$7 million by GPE Board on May 29, 2020 |
| b. | Allocation Requested (100%) | US$ 10M |
| c. | **Allocation Recommended** | US$ 7M[1] |
| d. | Grant Agent | UNICEF |
| e. | Agency Fee % (US$ amount) | 7% (US$ 490,000) |
| f. | Grant duration | 18 months |
| g. | Expected Start Date | 06/08/2020 |
| h. | Expected End Date | 11/30/2021 |

Secretariat assessment of proposal against program standards, with accompanying staff and management sign-off, is included as Annex 1. Grant Agent proposal is included as Annex 2.

3. **Recommendation: Grant is recommended for approval**

4. **Decision language:**

[1] Includes US$401,000 for the cost of the grant agent to perform its roles and responsibilities.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION**

In line with the delegated authority granted by the Board of Directors, the GPE CEO approves the COVID-19 accelerated funding request for Burundi in the amount of US$7,000,000 plus an additional US$ 490,000 in agency fees to UNICEF as Grant Agent. The grant has a start date of June 8, 2020, and an end date of November 30, 2021.

The GPE CEO recognized with appreciation the leadership and commitment of the Government of Burundi in preparing a national response plan and grant proposal that will mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the education sector as well as support the recovery of the education system from the crisis.

The GPE Board approved the COVID-19 funding mechanism on a first come, first served approach for the first US$ 125 million of the original US$225 million COVID-19 country funding window. Although the remaining US$ 100 million has been subsequently significantly increased to US$ 350 million by the Board, the demand for the COVID-19 funding mechanism still exceeds the available funds and the maximum allocation for Burundi is now US$ 7 million, lower than the initial allocation and requested amount of US$ 10 million.

Unless otherwise indicated by the decision language request for Report-Back, and keeping within the original budget of each component, the government and grant agent have full authority to prioritize within the approved activities of the original application, after consultation with the local education group.

Recognizing the GPE Board's intent to proceed with the COVID-19 funding on a timeline which acknowledges the COVID-19 emergency, the Government and Grant Agent are asked to move forward with implementation immediately while addressing the following points and reporting back to the Secretariat by June 29, 2020:

**Request for Report-Back**

a) The Grant Agent is requested to provide a revised program document (including results framework and budget), to be sent after grant approval, following consultation with the LEG and agreement by the Government on the changes including the prioritization.

b) Activities with clear and immediate impact on the continuation and safeguarding of education for vulnerable populations during the COVID-19 crisis be prioritized over activities that provide lesser immediate value for money for this purpose.

c) The Secretariat commends the inclusion of interventions in the program that will directly support the return to school of the most vulnerable students. Nevertheless, the Secretariat requests that further clarification on the targeting criteria and methodology be included in the revised program document, specifically for sub-component 1.2 on WASH activities.

d) Develop output and outcome indicators that include baselines, targets and gender disaggregation, where relevant, in the proposed Results Framework.

e) Include indicators 1,2, 3 of Table 1 and indicators 2 and 3 of Table 2 from the M&E guidance, reported both in number and percentage of beneficiary reached with the corresponding disaggregation.

The Secretariat also raises the following points of observation, which are recommendations rather than requirements:

**Observations**

a) Given the urgency of the crisis, GPE expects grant implementation to commence on schedule and the Grant Agent to submit a cash transfer request within two weeks of approval to facilitate the timely release of funds in support of program implementation.
b) An appropriate reduction in implementation support costs given the lower overall budget.
c) Further disseminate the Education COVID-19 Response Plan and make it publicly available.

**Reporting**

Please note that during the implementation period, the GPE Secretariat will require the Grant Agent to fill out a quarterly survey which will request core data on program implementation. At the end of the implementation period, the Grant Agent is expected to submit a completion report to the GPE Secretariat. Detailed information on the reporting requirement is available in the Guidelines for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding on GPE website.

**Reprogramming**

The Government and the Grant Agent may reprogram this grant, in consultation with the Local Education Group and where active the Education cluster, for an amount not to exceed 25% of the allocation without prior Secretariat approval but must disclose such cases to the Secretariat. For an amount of 25% or more, as well as for any extension, advance approval from the Secretariat must be sought. The process for advanced approval will be that of non-minor revisions of ESPIG which can be found here: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/policy-education-sector-program-implementation-grants

CEO Approval:
Alice P. Albright
Chief Executive Officer
Global Partnership for Education



Date: June 8, 2020

**CEO Memo - Annex 1**
**Program Standards for Assessment of**
**COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Applications (Country Grants)**

(Last updated April 2020)

*The GPE Secretariat will complete this matrix to assess country applications for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding.*

| **Program Standards: COVID-19 Accelerated Funding** | | | | **Comments** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Country:** | | | BURUNDI | |
| **Grant Agent:** | | | UNICEF | |
| **Date of Submission:** | | | Request submitted to GPE Secretariat: 5/11/2020 | |
| | | | Secretariat Review completed: 6/4/2020 | |
| Yes | No | N/A | **Eligibility** | |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the Country eligible for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding? | Yes, up to $10 million originally, and following the Board decision on 29 March 2020, this was revised to $7 million. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the grant agent accredited by GPE? *Please confirm via COVID-19 FAQ list.* | UNICEF is GA |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Has GA selection followed a clear and transparent process, with the process documented in the proposal?[2] | After a call for expressions of interest, the MoE, through a Committee comprising representatives from the Ministry and one representative from a CSO (World Vision), nominated UNICEF as GA for both the COVID-19 Accelerated Funding and the 'regular' Accelerated Funding Window. The GSE (LEG) endorsed the Grant Agent selection. Communications shared with the GPE Secretariat confirm the transparency of the EOI and selection process. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Has the proposal been endorsed by the Local Education Group (and the Education Cluster where relevant)? | Following a request from the Secretariat, the grant agent (also coordinating agency) clarified that the proposal was endorsed on May 29, 2020. The Working Group on Education in Emergencies is recognized as the Education Cluster in Burundi and is a member of the LEG. It has been directly involved |

[2] If a grant agent has been selected for the 'regular' Accelerated Funding window announced in December 2019, the government can decide to maintain the same grant agent for the COVID-19 accelerated funding.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | in the development of both the sector response plan and the grant proposal, and has participated in the endorsement of the proposal. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the proposal based on a publicly available government response plan related to COVID-19, including education? *The proposal should explain where and how the response plan has been made publicly available (e.g., Government website, distribution to key stakeholders, etc.).* | The Education COVID-19 Response Plan was based on the National COVID-19 Response Plan. The proposal indicates that the application is based on the Education COVID-19 Response Plan, which was developed with the support of the working group on education in emergencies (GdT ESU) and members of the GSE (LEG). Therefore, evidence shows that the plan is available to key stakeholders.<br><br>Decision language: (observation)<br>**Further disseminate the Education COVID-19 Response Plan and make it publicly available.** |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Will the program become effective within one month of GPE approval, with completion within 12-18 months from the date of program effectiveness? | The estimated starting date of the program is June 1, 2020. The timeline provided indicates that 5 activities will start in June (1.1.1, 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 4.1.3). The program is expected to be completed in 18 months (end date of the program is November 30, 2021). |
| **The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐** | | | | |
| Yes | No | N/A | **Program Design & Coordination** | |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are proposal activities (i) supporting basic education only, (ii) within the boundary of eligible activities under this funding window (see COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Guidelines, which focus on recovery and mitigation), or, if not within the boundary, are from the government response plan and well-justified, and (iii) likely to support program objectives / progress toward expected outputs and intermediate outcomes? | Although the application explicitly indicates that activities under some sub-components (1.2, 2.1 and 2.2.1) will support basic education, it does not mention it systematically for each activity considered for the program. The GA has clarified that all activities of the proposal will cover basic education only.<br><br>The GA has clarified that all the proposed interventions under components 1, 2 and 3 are identified from the Education COVID-19 Response Plan.<br><br>Interventions are proposed under four dimensions:<br>1) Implement safe control protocol to have safe, protective and inclusive schools (psychosocial support for teachers, students and parents; improvement of water infrastructure, sanitation and hygiene interventions in schools); |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 2) Ensure continuity of learning and give access to distance-learning materials for the most vulnerable (develop and broadcast educational audio content; ensure access to distance-learning platform for all, with a focus on the most vulnerable);<br>3) Prepare for a smooth reopening of schools with safe and supportive school environments (ensure provision of school supplies and hygiene kits for girls; organize remedial classes and refresher courses; extend school canteens coverage);<br>4) Support monitoring and evaluation of the project activities (implement a real-time data collection mechanism, strengthen institutional capacities in the field of data collection, support M&E missions on the ground).<br><br>The project's results framework, implementation roadmap and budget provide assurance that outputs, outcomes and objectives of the proposal can be met. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the program, to a sufficient degree, reach poor, vulnerable, or otherwise disadvantaged children, including girls, affected by the COVID-19 pandemic? *For targeted interventions, the proposal should include the targeting criteria to ensure equity (i.e., that interventions reach vulnerable populations).* | The program identifies activities to support vulnerable groups including girls, children in rural and suburban areas, children from poor households, and children with special needs.<br><br>The program mentions that special support will be given to vulnerable groups, including children with special needs. The Grant Agent has clarified that the program will ensure that at least 12% of the program will target children with disabilities. Construction activities, rehabilitation of water points, and installation of hand washing devices will be inclusive with easier access for children living with disabilities.<br><br>Several activities will target the most vulnerable children: awareness campaigns on unwanted pregnancies and gender-based violence, distribution of radios for vulnerable households, pedagogical monitoring of vulnerable children, distribution of school supplies for children from the most vulnerable provinces, hygiene kits for girls, remedial classes and refresher courses for vulnerable children and extension of school canteens coverage. However, while it is understood that activities under sub-component 1.2 on |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | WASH, hygiene kits, constructions and rehabilitation of water points will focus on deprived schools, no further information is provided on the targeting (which regions, number of regions, etc.).<br><br>Decision language:<br>**The Secretariat commends the inclusion of interventions in the program that will directly support the return to school of the most vulnerable students. Nevertheless, the Secretariat requests that further clarification on the targeting criteria and methodology be included in the revised program document, specifically for sub-component 1.2 on WASH activities.** |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the program, to a sufficient degree, identify and address specific barriers to learning faced by girls due to COVID-19? ** | The program identifies barriers to learning that girls face, such as that the risks of sexual abuse are recurring and often lead to unwanted pregnancies. Other negative factors on school attendance are linked to a lack of sanitation and hygiene. Under subcomponent 1.1, the program proposes interventions that focus on establishing safe control protocols. Special emphasis will be placed on the prevention of gender-based violence and early pregnancies. In addition, potential victims will have access to specialized psychosocial and health assistance services.<br><br>Furthermore, under subcomponent 3.1, the most vulnerable girls will receive dignity kits upon return to school. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the proposal identify a relevant COVID-19 response coordination mechanism(s) and confirm that the program will be represented in this mechanism? | The working group on education in emergencies (GdT ESU), which has developed the Education COVID-19 Response Plan, is the body identified to ensure a relevant COVID-19 response coordination mechanism, assess the situation and adjust interventions across the sector, if necessary. UNICEF, which is the GA of the proposed grant, is co-leading the GdT ESU with the Ministry of Education (MEFTP). UNICEF also co-leads the GSE (LEG) with the MEFTP. Both the GdT ESU and the GSE will be involved in the monitoring of the program performance: members of these groups will take part in M&E missions and in the preparation of project implementation reports and presentations. Those will be presented during GdT ESU and GSE meetings. It is noted that the project implementation presentations will allow for shared |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | knowledge of the project implementation status and ensure complementarity of different interventions across the sector. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the proposal (i) provide information on the sources of financing for COVID response and early recovery activities planned and (ii) information demonstrating that GPE funds will be complementary to government or other donor funding, including from Education Cannot Wait, where relevant? | The proposal identifies other sources of funding from the Government, UNICEF, World Food Program, World Bank and World Vision. No ECW funding is anticipated. The proposal indicates that the GPE COVID-19 accelerated funding application aims to intensify and scale up interventions implemented/that will be implemented by other donor partners and the Government.<br><br>The working group on education in emergencies (GdT ESU) will allow for the coordination of all sources of funding. |
| **The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐** | | | | |
| Yes | No | N/A | **Budget** | |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the proposed budget (excluding agency fee) within the GPE Board approved allocation for the country? * | The proposed budget is within the original allocation of US$10 M and will be revised downwards in line with the revised budget of US$ 7M. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the submitted budget clearly outline component, activity and grant agent implementation support costs? *Estimated unit costs and quantities should be clearly indicated. (Budget can be provided in a separate document from program document, preferably in a spreadsheet format) ** | Yes. A separate budget spreadsheet is provided detailing costs per component, unit costs and GA support costs. GA support costs represent 4% of the grant, which is a reasonable proportion. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is there a clear indication of the program's sources of funding, including which parts of the program are supported by each source? * | Yes. The GPE grant is presented as stand-alone. Other donor C19 education relief activities are discussed but are distinct in activities. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the budget, and its assumptions, coherent with other parts of the program design? *This includes coherence between budgeted quantities and results framework output indicators where possible. ** | Yes. The budget aligns to the components in the programme document and the results framework. |
| **The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐** | | | | |
| Yes | No | N/A | **M & E and Results Framework** | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the proposed M & E framework costed and likely to support effective monitoring of program implementation and results reporting? [3] Are roles and responsibilities clearly mapped? ** | The M&E framework is costed. M&E arrangements appear to be adequate, and roles and responsibilities are included in the program. |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the program include a complete results framework, including the key output and outcome indicators, baselines and targets and data sources? *Indicators should be disaggregated by gender where relevant. ** | The results framework does not provide associated baselines and relevant data disaggregation's. Data sources are mentioned in the results framework proposed.<br><br>Decision language:<br>**Develop output and outcome indicators that include baselines, targets and gender disaggregation, where relevant, in the proposed Results Framework.**<br><br>Following the confirmation by grant agent and this decision language, the standard is addressed to Secretariat satisfaction. |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the proposal confirm agreement to collect and report on required core indicators (where relevant) and follow GPE M&E Guidance for COVID-19 AF Grants, including on standardized program reporting? ** | No. Following the proposed activities (2.2.1; 1.2.1; 1.1.3, and 1.2.2 from the program's results framework), the revised results framework should include indicators 1, 2 and 3 of table 1 and indicator 3 of table 2 from the GPE M&E guidance both in number and percentage of beneficiary reached, with the relevant disaggregation.<br><br>Furthermore, the program mentions activities related to supporting the reopening of schools, in sub-component 3.1, therefore, it is recommended that the revised results framework also includes indicator 2 of table 2 from the M&E guidance.<br><br>Decision language: |

[3] Government-led school census and EMIS activities may be disrupted because of the pandemic; the proposal should ensure available capacity and financing for data collection with this risk in mind.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Include indicators 1,2, 3 of Table 1 and indicators 2 and 3 of Table 2 from the M&E guidance, reported both in number and percentage of beneficiary reached with the corresponding disaggregation.**<br><br>Following the confirmation by grant agent and this decision language, the standard is addressed to Secretariat satisfaction. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the proposal include an activity line and budget for development and implementation of an approach to learning from evidence? *(see GPE M&E Guidance for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Grants) ** | A costed learning from evidence approach is present under component 4. |
| **The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☐ No ☒** | | | | |
| Yes | No | N/A | **Implementation Arrangements & Readiness** | |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the proposal include a sufficiently detailed implementation plan with a timeline, activities, and roles and responsibilities clearly described? | A timeline is provided both in the program document and in the budget file for the implementation of all the project activities. Entities responsible for each activity are also defined, at the central level. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are implementation arrangements sufficiently well-described to identify program management structures, responsible actors and processes? | Program management structures are clear and responsible actors have been identified at the central level. The proposal indicates that UNICEF will increase its staff to ensure a smooth management of the project. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are implementation arrangements are sufficiently described to determine flow of funds? * | Yes. UNICEF HACT procedures described include GA direct payment and cost reimbursement modalities. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are proposed financial management, auditing, and procurement arrangements clearly described and appropriate for the country context? * | Yes. UNICEF HACT procedures and staffing / sourcing arrangements for FM, audit and procurement are adequately described. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are proposed sub-contracting arrangements clearly described and appropriate? | Some of the implementation partners identified are civil society organizations (CSOs). The proposal notes that cash advances to the CSOs for the implementation of those activities will be provided in strict compliance with the HACT procedure. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are implementation support and oversight arrangements by the grant agent well described? | The GA's responsibilities in the planning, coordination, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of interventions are well described. In total, five |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | staff will be dedicated to the project, including two new staff positions to support implementation and procurement activities. |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the proposal ensure implementation arrangements will be in place to ensure rapid start-up? Specifically, will fiduciary and administrative arrangements allow for disbursement by the proposed start date? Will major interventions will be ready to be launched by the proposed start date? * | Yes. In the risk assessment, the GA considers that its existing infrastructure and resources are, or are in the process of being, prepared to implement the C19 response programme. |
| **The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐** | | | | |
| Yes | No | N/A | **Risk Assessment and Mitigation** | |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are risks / insecurity that could threaten any vulnerable population (e.g. girls, displaced children) identified, with mitigation actions proposed?[4] | The proposal integrates a risk identification and mitigation framework that is sound. Although they are not entirely addressed in this framework, risks affecting vulnerable populations, including poor, rural and suburban children and girls have been identified and measures are proposed in several interventions to address them. Even though the proposal does not identify risks that children with disabilities face and that will be exacerbated with the crisis, the Grant Agent has clarified that measures are proposed in several interventions to address them (at least 12% of the program). |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are risks related to fiduciary arrangements, including financial management, procurement, governance, and safeguards issues (harm to people or the environment) and adequate mitigation actions are identified? * | Yes. UNICEF HACT measures are outlined as mitigations for FM and procurement risk. Environmental and physical health risk and mitigation measures are included. Component 1 includes wellbeing actions to mitigate gender-based violence, mental and social wellbeing. |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | For grants exceeding US $5 million and the Grant Agent is an INGO: are there any significant risks regarding the capacity of the country office to perform the GA role that do not appear to be mitigated (e.g. through increased support from regional or HQ level, etc.)? | n/a |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the proposal trigger any GPE policies (e.g., GPE Private Sector Policy) which would require | The GA has clarified that the proposal does not provide any support to private schools. |

[4] For example, does the proposal refer to international health and safety standards regarding school closure, or guidance on re-opening schools?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | extraordinary consultation with GPE governance structures? | |
| **The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐** | | | | |
| *Please provide additional comments/details, if necessary.* | | | | |

**Feedback in the above templated was completed, reviewed and approved for CEO decision by the following persons, on the date indicated:**

**Completed by (COVID-19 Education Specialist):** Inès Boumaïza **Date** 05/26/2020

**Completed by (Risk and Finance related questions as per *):** Simon Hall **Date** 05/26/2020

**Completed by (M & E related questions as per **)** Sissy Helguero**:** **Date:** 05/26/2020

**Reviewed by (CL):** Adrien Boucher **Date:** 6/4/2020

**Reviewed by (QA): David Balwanz** **Date 6/4/2020**

**Reviewed by (Team Lead):** Matthew Smith **Date:** 6/4/2020

**Approved by (jointly by QA and Team Lead if <$1m):** n/a

**Approved by (Manager 1 if >$1m and up to $10m): Margarita Licht** **Date 6/5/2020**

**Approved by (Manager 2 if >$10m):** n/a